arXiv:1602.09127v1 [cs.DM] 29 Feb 2016

Stable Equimatchable Graphs *

Zakir Deniz [1] Tınaz Ekim [2]

[1] *Department of Mathematics, Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey*
[2] *Department of Industrial Engineering, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey*

received –, revised –, accepted –.

A graph G is *equimatchable* if every maximal matching of G has the same cardinality. We are interested in equimatchable graphs such that the removal of any edge from the graph preserves the equimatchability. We call an equimatchable graph G *edge-stable* if $G\backslash e$ is equimatchable for any $e \in E(G)$. After noticing that edge-stable equimatchable graphs are either 2-connected factor-critical or bipartite, we characterize edge-stable equimatchable graphs. This characterization yields an $O(\min(n^{3.376}, n^{1.5}m))$ time recognition algorithm. We also define *vertex-stable* equimatchable graphs and show that they admit a simpler characterization. Lastly, we introduce and shortly discuss the related notions of *edge-critical* and *vertex-critical* equimatchable graphs, pointing out the most interesting case in their characterization as an open question.

Keywords: Maximal matching, edge-stability, vertex-stability, edge-criticality, vertex-criticality.

1 Introduction

A graph G is *equimatchable* if every maximal matching of G has the same cardinality. These graphs are mainly considered from structural point of view (see for instance Eiben and Kotrbcik (2016); Favaron (1986); Lesk et al. (1984); Kawarabayashi and Plummer (2009)). In this paper, we study equimatchable graphs from a new perspective; we deal with the stability of the property of being equimatchable with respect to edge or vertex removals. Formally, we call an equimatchable graph G *edge-stable* if $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable for each $e \in E(G)$. Edge-stable equimatchable graphs are denoted ESE-*graphs* as a shorthand. Similarly, an equimatchable graph G is called *vertex-stable* (VSE for short) if $G - v$ is equimatchable for each $v \in V(G)$.

We start in Section 2 with some definitions and preliminary results on ESE-graphs. As justified by Theorem 3, we describe ESE-graphs under three categories: 2-connected factor-critical ESE-graphs in Section 3, ESE-graphs with a cut-vertex in Section 4 (it turns out that these are all bipartite ESE-graphs), and bipartite ESE-graphs in Section 5. These results provide a full characterization of all ESE-graphs yielding an $O(\min(n^{3.376}, n^{1.5}m))$ time recognition algorithm (in Section 6) which is better than the most natural way of recognizing ESE-graphs by checking the equimatchability of $G \setminus e$ for every $e \in E$. In the same line as edge-stability, in Section 7, we study vertex-stable equimatchable graphs; it turns out that their characterization is much simpler than the characterization of ESE-graph. Finally, in Section

*The support of 213M620 Turkish-Slovenian TUBITAK-ARSS Joint Research Project is greatly acknowledged.

ISSN subm. to DMTCS © 2015 by the author(s) Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

8, we introduce the opposite notions of edge-critical and vertex-critical equimatchable graphs (called respectively ECE-graphs and VCE-graphs) which are minimally equimatchable graphs with respect to edges and vertices, respectively. We conclude by giving some insight on our ongoing work about ECE-graphs and VCE-graphs.

2 Definitions and Preliminaries

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a subset of vertices I, $G[I]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by I, and $G \setminus I = G[V \setminus I]$. When I is a singleton $\{v\}$, we denote $G \setminus I$ by $G - v$. We also denote by $G \setminus e$ the graph $G(V, E \setminus \{e\})$. For a subset I of vertices, we say that I is *complete* to another subset I' of vertices (or by abuse of notation, to a subgraph H) if all vertices of I are adjacent to all vertices of I' (respectively H). K_r is a clique on r vertices. For a vertex v, the neighborhood of v in a subgraph H is denoted by $N_H(v)$. We omit the subscript H whenever it is clear from the context. For a subset $V' \subseteq V$, $N(V')$ is the union of the neighborhoods of the vertices in V'.

Given a graph G, the size of a maximum matching of G is denoted by $\nu(G)$. A matching is *maximal* if no other matching properly contains it. A matching M is said to *saturate* a vertex v if v is the endvertex of some edge in M, otherwise it leaves a vertex *exposed*. If every matching of G extends to a perfect matching, then G is called *randomly matchable*. Clearly, if an equimatchable graph has a perfect matching, then it is randomly matchable. If $G - v$ has a perfect matching for each $v \in V(G)$, then G is called *factor-critical*. For short, a factor-critical equimatchable graph is called an EFC-*graph*.

We notice that G is ESE if and only if every connected component of G is ESE. Therefore, in the remainder of this paper, we only consider connected ESE-graphs.

Let us first show a basic property of ESE-graphs which will be useful in our proofs.

Proposition 1. *Let G be an* ESE*-graph with at least 3 vertices, then $\nu(G) = \nu(G \setminus e)$ for each $e \in E(G)$.*

Proof: Let G be an ESE-graph and assume for a contradiction that $\nu(G) = \nu(G \setminus e) + 1$ for some $e \in E(G)$. It follows that there is a maximal matching M (of G) containing e for $e = uv \in E(G)$ such that $M \setminus e$ is also a maximal matching in $G \setminus e$. By definition of ESE-graphs, there exists $w \in N(u) \cup N(v)$, without loss of generality say $wu \in E(G)$. Moreover wu can be extended to a maximal matching M' of G, thus by equimatchability of G, $|M| = |M'|$. Besides, M' is also a maximal matching in $G \setminus e$ of size $\nu(G)$, contradiction. □

The proof of Proposition 1 implies the following:

Corollary 2. *Let G be a* ESE*-graph with at least 3 vertices and M be a maximal matching of G. Then the followings hold:*

- (i) *G has no perfect matching.*
- (ii) *For every $e = uv \in M$, there exists a vertex w exposed by M which is adjacent to u or v.*

The following is a consequence of the results in Lesk et al. (1984) (although it is not explicitly mentioned in this paper) and will guide us through our characterization.

Theorem 3. *Lesk et al. (1984) A 2-connected equimatchable graph is either factor-critical or bipartite or K_{2t} for some $t \geq 1$.*

One can easily observe that the equimatchability of K_{2t} is lost when an edge is removed, hence K_{2t} is not ESE. It follows that ESE-graphs can be studied under three categories: 2-connected factor-critical, 2-connected bipartite and those having a cut vertex. Note that a bipartite graph can not be factor-critical, hence 2-connected factor-critical ESE-graphs and 2-connected bipartite ESE-graphs form a partition of 2-connected ESE-graphs into two disjoint subclasses. However, an ESE-graph with a cut-vertex can be either factor-critical, or bipartite, or none of them. Therefore a separate characterization of each one of these three categories would lead to a full characterization of all ESE-graphs with some overlaps (some graphs belonging to two categories). However, by showing in Section 4 that ESE-graphs with a cut vertex are bipartite, we provide a characterization containing only two exclusive cases: (2-connected) factor-critical ESE-graphs (Section 3) and bipartite ESE-graphs (Section 5).

3 Factor-critical ESE-graphs

Let us first underline that although we seek to characterize 2-connected ESE-graphs which are factor-critical, all the results in this section are valid for any connected graph. Note that factor-critical graphs are connected but not necessarily 2-connected. However, it turns out that factor-critical ESE-graphs are also 2-connected (See Corollary 12).

Remind that a factor-critical graph G has $\nu(G) = (|V(G)| - 1)/2$ and if it is equimatchable then all maximal matchings has size $(|V(G)| - 1)/2$.

Lemma 4. *Let G be a factor-critical graph. G is equimatchable if and only if there is no independent set I with 3 vertices such that $G \setminus I$ has a perfect matching.*

Proof: Let G be an EFC-graph. Then each maximal matching is of size $(|V(G)| - 1)/2$. If there is an independent set I with $|I| \geq 3$ and $G \setminus I$ has a perfect matching M, then M is also maximal matching in G and has size strictly less than $(|V(G)| - 1)/2$, a contradiction with being equimatchable.
Now, we suppose the converse. That is, for all independent set I with $|I| \geq 3$, $G \setminus I$ has no perfect matching. Assume G is not equimatchable and admits therefore a maximal matching of size strictly less than $\nu(G) = (|V(G)| - 1)/2$. Remark that, if there is a maximal matching M such that $|M| \leq \nu(G) - 2$, then there is also a maximal matching M' of size $\nu(G) - 1$ which can be obtained from M by repetitively using augmenting chains. Hence, there are exactly 3 vertices exposed by the matching M'. They form an independent set I in G and M' is a perfect matching in $G \setminus I$. This is a contradiction. So, G is equimatchable. □

Similarly, the following equivalence for an EFC-graph to be edge-stable will be very useful.

Lemma 5. *Let G be an* EFC*-graph. Then G is edge-stable if and only if there is no induced $\overline{P_3}$ in G such that $G \setminus \overline{P_3}$ has a perfect matching.*

Proof: Let G be an EFC-graph which is also edge-stable. Assume G has an induced $\overline{P_3}$ on vertices $\{v, u_1, u_2\}$ with an edge between u_1 and u_2 such that $G \setminus \{v, u_1, u_2\}$ has a perfect matching M. Then, M is a maximal matching of $G \setminus u_1u_2$ of size one less than M, contradicting the edge-stability of G by Proposition 1.
Now, let us consider the converse. Assume for a contradiction that G is not edge-stable. Then there is at least one edge u_1u_2 such that $G \setminus u_1u_2$ is not equimatchable. This means in particular that there is a maximal matching of $G \setminus u_1u_2$ leaving u_1, u_2 and one more vertex, say v, exposed (remind that all

maximal matchings of G leave exactly one vertex exposed). Therefore v is not adjacent to u_1 and u_2, thus $G[\{v, u_1, u_2\}] \cong \overline{P_3}$ and $M \setminus \{u_1u_2\}$ is a perfect matching of $G \setminus \{v, u_1, u_2\}$, a contradiction. □

Although it is not directly related to further results, the following gives some insight about the structure of ESE-graphs which are factor-critical. Remind that $diam(G) = \max\{d(u, v)|u, v \in V(G)\}$ where $d(u, v)$ is the *distance* (i.e., the length of the shortest path) between vertices u and v.

Corollary 6. *Let G be an* EFC*-graph. If G is edge-stable, then $diam(G) \leq 2$.*

Proof: Consider an EFC-graph G which is also edge-stable. Then, for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, there is a matching M_v leaving v as the only exposed vertex. By Lemma 5, v is adjacent to at least one of the endpoints of each edge in M_v, since otherwise G contains an induced subgraph $\overline{P_3}$ such that $G \setminus \overline{P_3}$ has a perfect matching. Since M_v saturates all vertices except v, we have $d(v, u) \leq 2$ for each $u \in V(G)$. By selecting v arbitrarily, we have $d(v, u) \leq 2$ for every pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ and therefore $diam(G) \leq 2$. □

Lemma 7. *Let G be a factor-critical graph with at least 7 vertices. If G is an* ESE*-graph which is not odd clique, then there is a nontrivial independent set S which is complete to $G \setminus S$.*

Proof: Assume G is a factor-critical ESE-graph with $2r + 1$ vertices for $r \geq 3$ and $G \ncong K_{2r+1}$, then let us show that G contains an independent set S with $|S| \geq 2$ which is complete to $G \setminus S$. Since G is not K_{2r+1}, it has a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) < 2r$. As G is factor-critical, $G - v$ has a perfect matching M. We define three sets of vertices according to M: let N_1 be the set of neighbors of v which are matched with non-neighbors of v, N_1' be the set of vertices matched to N_1, and N_2 be the set of neighbors of v matched to each other. Let $|N_1| = |N_1'| = t$ where $t \neq 0$ due to $d(v) < 2r$, and $|N_2| = 2p$. Note that $V(M) = N_1 \cup N_1' \cup N_2$ since otherwise there is an edge yz such that $\{y, z\} \cap (N_1 \cup N_1' \cup N_2) = \emptyset$ and $\{v, y, z\}$ induce a $\overline{P_3}$ whose removal leaves the perfect matching $M \setminus \{yz\}$, contradiction by Lemma 5 (see Figure 1).
We first note that N_1 is an independent set. Otherwise, there are u_i and u_j in N_1 such that $u_iu_j \in E(G)$. If $u_i'u_j' \notin E(G)$, then $\{u_i', u_j', v\}$ is an independent set I of size 3 and $(M \setminus \{u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{u_iu_j\}$ is a perfect matching of $G \setminus I$, implying that G is not equimatchable by Lemma 4. If $u_i'u_j' \in E(G)$, then $\{u_i', u_j', v\}$ induce a $\overline{P_3}$ in G such that $G \setminus \overline{P_3}$ has the same perfect matching as previously, contradicting that G is edge-stable by Lemma 5. It follows that N_1 is an independent set.

Claim 1. If N_1' is not an independent set then $N_2 = \emptyset$.

Proof of the Claim. Assume N_1' is not independent and $N_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $x_1x_1' \in M$ and consider an edge $u_i'u_j'$ in N_1'. Then, u_i is adjacent to x_1 or x_1', otherwise $G[\{u_i, x_1, x_1'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $M \setminus \{x_1x_1', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{vu_j, u_i'u_j'\}$ gives a perfect matching in $G \setminus \{u_i, x_1, x_1'\}$, a contradiction by Lemma 5. Similarly, u_j is adjacent to x_1 or x_1'. If $\{x_1, x_1'\} \subseteq N(u_i) \cup N(u_j)$, say without loss of generality $x_1u_i, x_1'u_j$, then $G[\{v, u_i', u_j'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{x_1u_i, x_1'u_j\}$ gives a perfect matching of $G \setminus \{v, u_i', u_j'\}$, a contradiction by Lemma 5. So, assume $\{x_1, x_1'\} \nsubseteq N(u_i) \cup N(u_j)$, then without loss of generality $\{u_i, u_j\} \in N(x_1)$. In this case, $\{u_i, u_j, x_1'\}$ is an independent set I and $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{vx_1, u_i'u_j'\}$ gives a perfect matching in $G \setminus I$, a contradiction with G being equimatchable by Lemma 4. It follows that $N_2 = \emptyset$. ♢



Fig. 1: A perfect matching M of $G - v$ where G is a factor-critical ESE-graph.

Claim 2. N_1' is complete to N_1.

Proof of the Claim. The case of $t = 1$ holds trivially. So assume that $t \geq 2$ and the claim is false, that is, there exist $u_k \in N_1$, $u_l' \in N_1'$ such that $u_k u_l' \notin E(G)$. If $u_k' u_l' \notin E(G)$, then $G[\{u_k, u_k', u_l'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{u_k, u_k', u_l'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{u_k u_k', u_l u_l'\}) \cup \{v u_l\}$, a contradiction by Lemma 5. So $u_k' u_l' \in E(G)$ and therefore N_1' is not an independent set. We remark that in this case $t \geq 3$ since $|V(G)| = 2r + 1$ for $r \geq 3$ and $N_2 = \emptyset$ by Claim 1. The followings hold by Lemma 5:

- $u_k u_s' \in E(G)$ for all $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$, since otherwise $G[\{u_k, u_s, u_s'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ for some $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$ and $G \setminus \{u_k, u_s, u_s'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{u_k u_k', u_l u_l', u_s u_s'\}) \cup \{v u_l, u_k' u_l'\}$. Also, by symmetry, $u_l u_s' \in E(G)$ for all $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$.

- $u_s u_k' \in E(G)$ for all $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$, otherwise $G[\{v, u_s, u_k'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ for some $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$ and $G \setminus \{v, u_s, u_k'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{u_k u_k', u_s u_s'\}) \cup \{u_k u_s'\}$. Also, by symmetry, $u_s u_l' \in E(G)$ for all $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$.

Now $G[\{v, u_k, u_l'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{v, u_k, u_l'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{u_k u_k', u_s u_s'\}) \cup \{u_s u_k', u_l u_s'\}$ for some $s \in [t] \setminus \{k, l\}$, contradiction by Lemma 5. It follows that $u_k u_l' \in E(G)$ for every pair $k, l \in [t]$, which completes the proof of the claim. ♢

Claim 3. If N_1' is not an independent set, then $N_1 = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t\}$ is a nontrivial independent set which is complete to $G \setminus N_1$.

Proof of the Claim. If N_1' is not independent (thus $t \geq 2$), then $N_2 = \emptyset$ by Claim 1 and $t \geq 3$ since G has at least 7 vertices. It follows from Claim 2 that $u_k u_l' \in E(G)$ for all $k, l \in [t]$. It suffices to notice that $S = N_1$ is an independent set which is complete $G \setminus S$. ♢

From now on, we assume that N_1' is an independent set and we have $u_ku_l' \in E(G)$ for all $k, l \in [t]$ by Claim 2. It can be observed that $N_2 \neq \emptyset$ since otherwise $G = K_{r,r+1}$ which is not factor-critical. If $wu_k' \in E(G)$ for all $w \in N_2$ and for all $k \in [t]$, then $S = N_1' \cup \{v\}$ is an independent set complete to $G \setminus S$. So assume that there is $w \in N_2$ and $u_k' \in N_1'$ for $k \in [t]$ such that $wu_k' \notin E(G)$, let $w = x_1$ without loss of generality, that is $x_1u_k' \notin E(G)$. Note that, for every $k \in [t]$, u_k' is adjacent to one of the endpoints of each edge in $\{x_1x_1', x_2x_2', \ldots, x_px_p'\}$; indeed if $\{x_i, x_i'\} \cap N(u_k') = \emptyset$ for some $i \in [p]$, then $G[\{u_k', x_i, x_i'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{u_k', x_i, x_i'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_ix_i', u_ku_k'\}) \cup \{vu_k\}$, a contradiction. Let without loss of generality $\{x_1', x_2', \ldots, x_p'\}$ be the neighbours of u_k'. We remark that x_1 must be adjacent to each vertex of N_1, otherwise, let $x_1u_l \notin E(G)$ for $l \in [t]$, then $G[\{x_1, u_l, u_k'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{x_1, u_l, u_k'\}$ has a perfect matching as $M' = (M \setminus \{x_1x_1', u_ku_k', u_lu_l'\}) \cup \{vx_1', u_ku_l'\}$, a contradiction. Similarly, if there is a vertex x_i for $i \in [p]$ such that $x_iu_k' \notin E(G)$, then x_i is adjacent to each vertex of N_1.

Now, we claim that $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p \notin N(u_k')$. Otherwise, let $x_iu_k' \in E(G)$ for $i \neq 1$. If there is a perfect matching P in $G[\{u_k, x_1', x_i, x_i'\}]$, then consider the $\overline{P_3}$ induced by $\{v, x_1, u_k'\}$ and note that $G \setminus \{v, x_1, u_k'\}$ contains the perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', x_ix_i', u_ku_k'\}) \cup P$, a contradiction. Assume $G[\{u_k, x_1', x_i, x_i'\}]$ has no perfect matching. Noting that $\nu(G[\{u_k, x_1', x_i, x_i'\}]) = 1$, this can only be the disjoint union of a star and (at most 2) isolated vertices, or a triangle and an isolated vertex, namely $K_{1,3}, K_3 \cup K_1, P_3 \cup K_1, P_2 \cup K_1 \cup K_1$ and each of these graphs contains either $\overline{P_3}$ or an independent set I of size 3. For such $\overline{P_3}$'s and I's, $G \setminus \overline{P_3}$ or $G \setminus I$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', x_ix_i', u_ku_k'\}) \cup \{vx_1, wu_k'\}$ where w is the vertex remaining from $\{u_k, x_1', x_i, x_i'\}$ after removing $\overline{P_3}$ or I (note that u_k' is adjacent to each of $\{u_k, x_1', x_i, x_i'\}$). This contradicts being ESE or equimatchable.

Remind that for every $j \in [p]$, x_j is complete to N_1. Moreover, we now claim that for every $j \in [p]$, x_j must be complete to $N(u_k')$ (recall that $x_ju_k' \notin E(G)$), otherwise let $x_jx_i' \notin E(G)$, then $G[\{x_j, x_i', u_k'\}] = \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{x_j, x_i', u_k'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_jx_j', x_ix_i', u_ku_k'\}) \cup \{vx_j', x_iu_k\}$, a contradiction with G being ESE. So x_j must be complete to $N(u_k') \setminus N_1$. As a result, for every $j \in [p]$, x_j is adjacent to each vertex of $N(u_k')$.

Besides, for every $j \in [p]$, x_j' has no neighbour in N_1 since otherwise let $x_j'u_l \in E(G)$ then for some $k \in [p]$, $G[\{v, x_j, u_k'\}]$ induces a $\overline{P_3}$ such that $G \setminus \{v, x_j, u_k'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_jx_j', u_lu_l', u_ku_k'\}) \cup \{u_lx_j', u_ku_l'\}$, a contradiction.

Furthermore, for every $j \in [p]$, x_j' is adjacent to each vertex of N_1' since otherwise let $x_j'u_l' \notin E(G)$ then $G[x_j', u_l', u_l]$ is a $\overline{P_3}$ such that $G \setminus \{x_j', u_l', u_l\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_jx_j', u_lu_l'\}) \cup \{vx_j\}$.

Now, we will show that any two x_i', x_j' can not be adjacent for $i, j \in [p]$. Assume the contrary, let $x_i'x_j' \in E(G)$ then $G[\{v, x_i, u_k'\}] \cong \overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{v, x_i, u_k'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_ix_i', x_jx_j', u_ku_k'\}) \cup \{u_kx_j, x_i'x_j'\}$, it gives a contradiction with being ESE-graph. Hence, $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t\} \cup \{x_1', x_2', \ldots, x_p'\}$ is an independent set. On the other hand, x_i is complete to $G \setminus (N_1 \cup N_2)$ for all $i \in [p]$. Hence $S = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t\} \cup \{x_1', x_2', \ldots, x_p'\}$ is an independent set which is complete to $G \setminus S$ as desired. □

For later purpose, we need to show that there is a nontrivial independent set S complete to $G \setminus S$ and having a special form with respect to the decomposition in Figure 1.

Corollary 8. *Let G be a factor-critical graph with at least 7 vertices. If G is an* ESE*-graph which is not an odd clique, then for some $v \in V(G)$, G has a decomposition as described in Figure 1 where $S = N_1' \cup \{v\}$ is a nontrivial independent set which is complete to $G \setminus S$, and N_1 is an independent set.*

Proof: By Lemma 7, there is a nontrivial independent set S complete to $G \setminus S$. Taking any vertex $v \in S$,

since G is factor-critical, $G - v$ has a perfect matching M. It is easy to see that M matches the vertices of $S \setminus v$ to a subset $S' \subset V(G \setminus S)$, since $S \setminus v$ is independent. We also remark that S' is an independent set, since otherwise let $y'z' \in G[S']$ and $yy', zz' \in M$ for $y, z \in S \setminus v$ and $y', z' \in S'$, then $\{v, y, z\}$ is an independent set and $(M \setminus \{yy', zz'\}) \cup \{y'z'\}$ is a perfect matching on $G \setminus \{v, y, z\}$, contradiction with equimatchability of G.
Now, one can observe that G has a decomposition as described Figure 1 where $S \setminus v = N_1'$, $S' = N_1$ and $G \setminus (S \cup S') = N_2$. Note that, N_1' is complete to $N_1 \cup N_2$, and N_1 is an independent set. □

We define two graph families $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ corresponding to the cases where the nontrivial independent set S described in Corollary 8 has respectively 2 or more vertices. A graph G belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$ if $G \cong K_{2r+1} \setminus M$ for some nonempty matching M and $r \geq 3$. A graph G of $\mathcal{G}_1$ is illustrated in Figure 2(a) where the edges in $G[N_1 \cup N_2] \cong K_{2r-1} \setminus (M \setminus vu_1')$ are not drawn, and $S = \{v, u_1'\}$ is complete to $G \setminus S$. Besides, $\mathcal{G}_2$ is defined as the family of graphs G admitting an independent set S of size at least 3 which is complete to $G \setminus S$ and such that $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$. In Figure 2(b), we show an illustration of a graph G in $\mathcal{G}_2$ where $S = N_1' \cup \{v\}$ with $|S| \geq 3$ and $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$. Again, the edges in $G[N_1 \cup N_2]$ are not drawn but just described by the property $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$.



(a) Illustration of a graph G in $\mathcal{G}_1$ with $G[N_1 \cup N_2] \cong K_{2r-1} \setminus (M \setminus vu_1')$

(b) Illustration of a graph in $\mathcal{G}_2$ with $S = N_1' \cup \{v\}$

Fig. 2: Factor-critical ESE-graph families $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$.

Theorem 9. *Let G be a factor-critical graph with at least 7 vertices. Then, G is* ESE *if and only if either G is an odd clique or it belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$.*

Proof: Given a factor-critical graph G, it is clear that $G \cong K_{2r+1}$ is an ESE-graph. Assume that G belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$ and we will show that G is ESE-graph. First, let G be in $\mathcal{G}_1$, that is $G \cong K_{2r+1} \setminus M$ where M is a nonempty matching, then every maximal matching of G has r edges (indeed G has no independent set of size 3, hence no maximal matching of size $r-1$), thus G is equimatchable. In addition, G is $\overline{P_3}$-free, hence ESE by Lemma 5.

Now, let G be in $\mathcal{G}_2$, then by definition of $\mathcal{G}_2$, we have $|S| \geq 3$ and $G \setminus S$ induces a graph whose matching number is equal to 1. Consider a vertex $v \in S$. Since G is factor-critical, $G - v$ has a perfect

matching where all vertices in S are necessarily matched to some vertex in $G \setminus S$. If this perfect matching contains an edge in $G \setminus S$ then $|S| = |V(G \setminus S)| - 1$, otherwise $|S| = |V(G \setminus S)| + 1$. Applying the same argument to a vertex $v' \in G \setminus S$, we have either $|S| = |V(G \setminus S)| - 3$ (in case a perfect matching of $G - v'$ contains an edge in $G \setminus S$), or $|S| = |V(G \setminus S)| - 1$ (otherwise). It follows that the only possible case is $|V(G \setminus S)| = |S| + 1$.

We claim that G is equimatchable. Since S is complete to $G \setminus S$, we have either $I \subseteq S$ or $I \subseteq G \setminus S$ for independent set I with 3 vertices. If $I \subseteq S$, then $G \setminus I$ has no perfect matching; indeed all vertices of $S \setminus I$ has to be matched to vertices in $G \setminus S$, leaving 4 vertices in $G \setminus S$ exposed (because $|I| = 3$) that can not be all saturated since $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$. Otherwise, if $I \subseteq G \setminus S$ and $G \setminus I$ has no perfect matching because there are $|S|$ vertices that can not be matched to remaining $|S| - 2$ vertices of $(G \setminus S) \setminus I$. Hence G is equimatchable. Now, we claim that G is edge-stable. Let $R \subset V(G)$ such that $G[R] \cong \overline{P_3}$. It then follows that $R \subseteq V(G \setminus S)$ since every vertex of S is adjacent to all vertices in $G \setminus S$. It can be observe that there is no perfect matching in $G \setminus R$ because there are $|S|$ vertices that can not be matched to remaining $|S| - 2$ vertices of $(G \setminus S) \setminus R$. Hence G is edge-stable.

Now, let us show the converse. First assume that if G is K_{2r+1}, it is clearly ESE. So, assume that G is a factor-critical ESE-graph with $|V(G)| = 2r + 1$ and $G \ncong K_{2r+1}$, that is $|M| \geq 1$. We will show that G is in $\mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$, in other words, there is an independent set S complete to $G \setminus S$ which satisfies the conditions. By Lemma 7 and Corollary 8 we have an independent set $S = \{v, u'_1, u'_2, \ldots, u'_t\}$ for some v and a matching M saturating all vertices but v (see Figure 1).
Firstly, let $|S| = 2$, then $|N_1| = 1$. We note that in this case $p \geq 2$ since $2r + 1 \geq 7$. We will show that $G \cong K_{2r+1} \setminus M$, where M is a matching in K_{2r+1}. We suppose that it is not true, then there exists $w_1, w_2, w_3 \in N_1 \cup N_2$ such that $G[\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}] \cong \overline{P_3}$ or an independent set of size 3. Noting that S is complete to $N_1 \cup N_2$ and that without loss of generality, x_1, x'_1 can be considered for some x_i, x'_i pair, the following cases cover all possibilities for w_1, w_2, w_3.

- (a) If $w_1 = u_1 \in N_1$, $w_2 = x_1 \in N_2$, $w_3 = x'_1 \in N_2$, then $P = \{vx_2, x'_2u'_1, x_3x'_3, \ldots x_px'_p\}$ is a perfect matching in $G \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$.
- (b) If $w_1 = u_1 \in N_1$, $w_2 = x_1 \in N_2$, $w_3 = x_2 \in N_2$, then $P = \{vx'_1, x'_2u'_1, x_3x'_3, \ldots, x_px'_p\}$ is a perfect matching in $G \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$.
- (c) If $w_1 = x_1$, $w_2 = x_2$, $w_3 = x'_2$, then $P = \{u_1u'_1, vx'_1, x_3x'_3, \ldots, x_px'_p\}$ is a perfect matching in $G \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$.
- (d) If $w_1 = x_1$, $w_2 = x_2$, $w_3 = x_3$, then there are two cases. If there is an edge $e \in E(G[\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}])$, say without loss of generality $e = x'_1x'_2$, then $P = \{u_1u'_1, e = x'_1x'_2, vx'_3, x_4x'_4, \ldots, x_px'_p\}$ is a perfect matching in $G \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$. Assume now that $G[\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}]$ is a null graph. If one of the edges $u_1x'_1$, $u_1x'_2$ or $u_1x'_3$ exists, say without loss of generality $u_1x'_1$, then $G \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ has a perfect matching $P = \{vx'_2, u_1x'_1, u'_1x'_3, x_4x'_4, \ldots, x_px'_p\}$. Otherwise, we can conclude in exactly the same manner as in Case (b) by considering $\{u_1, x_1, x_2\}$ as $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$.

In all these cases, we conclude by Lemma 4 and 5 that there is a contradiction, hence $G \cong K_{2r+1} \setminus M$ where M is a matching of K_{2r+1} and consequently G belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$ (see Figure 2(a)).

Assume now $|S| \geq 3$. We need the following claim to show that $G[N_1 \cup N_2]$ induces a graph whose matching number is equal to 1.

Claim 1. $|N_2| = 2$

Proof of the Claim. If $|N_2| = 0$, then for $w \in N_1$, $G - w$ has no perfect matching, hence G can not be factor-critical. So assume for a contradiction that $p > 1$. Note that $|N_1| = |N_1'| = t \geq 2$ due to $|S| \geq 3$, let $u_i', u_j' \in N_1'$. First we observe that no vertex in N_2 forms an independent set with $\{u_i, u_j\}$. Assume for a contradiction that there exists a vertex $w \in N_2$, say without loss of generality $w = x_1$ such that $\{u_i, u_j\} \cap N(x_1) = \emptyset$, that is $\{u_i, u_j, x_1\}$ is an independent set in G, then we can obtain a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', x_2x_2', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{vx_1', u_i'x_2, u_j'x_2'\}$, a contradiction with being equimatchable. It follows that for all $w \in N_2$, $N(w) \cap \{u_i, u_j\} \neq \emptyset$. If there exists $u_i \in N_1$ such that u_i is not adjacent to vertices $\{x_k, x_k'\}$, say without loss of generality $k = 1$, then $\{u_i, x_1, x_1'\}$ induces a $\overline{P_3}$ and $G \setminus \{u_i, x_1, x_1'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', x_2x_2', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup \{vu_j, u_i'x_2, u_j'x_2'\}$, contradiction with being edge-stable. Consequently, for any pair $u_i, u_j \in N_1$ and $x_k, x_k' \in N_2$, the graph induced by $\{u_i, u_j, x_k, x_k'\}$ contains a perfect matching P since the only graphs on 4 vertices with matching number 1 are $K_{1,3}$, $K_3 \cup K_1$ and $K_2 \cup K_1 \cup K_1$, and $G[\{u_i, u_j, x_k, x_k'\}]$ induces none of them by the above properties. Now, we notice that $\{v, u_i', u_j'\}$ is an independent set and $G \setminus \{v, u_i', u_j'\}$ has a perfect matching $(M \setminus \{x_kx_k', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup P$. This is a contradiction with being equimatchable. So, $|N_2| = 2$. ♢

Let $N_2 = \{x_1, x_1'\}$. Now, if $\nu(G \setminus S) \geq 2$, then there are 4 vertices u_i, u_j, x_1, x_1' such that $G[\{u_i, u_j, x_1, x_1'\}]$ has a perfect matching P (remind that $u_iu_j \notin E(G)$ since N_1 is an independent set); now $(M \setminus \{x_1x_1', u_iu_i', u_ju_j'\}) \cup P$ is a maximal matching in G of size $(|V(G)| - 3)/2$, contradiction with equimatchability (see Figure 2(b)). Hence G belongs to $\mathcal{G}_2$. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 10. *For every $r \geq 3$, there are exactly $2r + 2$ factor-critical* ESE*-graphs on $2r + 1$ vertices.*

Proof: A nonempty matching of K_{2r+1} has size between 1 and r, implying that there are r non-isomorphic graphs of family $\mathcal{G}_1$ in Theorem 9, that is isomorphic to $K_{2r+1} \setminus M$ for some nonempty matching M. If G is of family $\mathcal{G}_2$ (see Figure 2(b)) then, $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$ implies that $G[N_1 \cup N_2]$ can only be a disjoint union of isolated vertices and one triangle or one star where the edge x_1x_1' belongs to this unique triangle or star. Since all vertices of $N_1 \cup N_2$ are symmetric with respect to their neighborhoods outside of $N_1 \cup N_2$, there are exactly r ways of forming a star (note that N_1 has $(2r + 1 - 3)/2 = r - 1$ vertices) and just 1 way to form a triangle. Summing up all possibilities together being $G \cong K_{2r+1}$, there are in total $2r + 2$ factor-critical ESE-graphs. □

Remark 11. We determined all factor-critical ESE-graphs whose orders are at most 5 vertices by using computer programming (Python-Sage). There are just 7 such graphs: K_1, K_3, K_5, C_5 and the following three graphs in Figure 3.



Fig. 3: Some factor-critical ESE-graphs with 5 vertices.

By observing that all the graphs described in Theorem 9 and Remark 11 are 2-connected, we obtain as a byproduct the following:

Corollary 12. *Factor-critical* ESE*-graphs are 2-connected.*

4 ESE-graphs with a cut vertex

The main objective of this section is to show that ESE-graphs with a cut vertex are bipartite. Then, we will complete our characterization in the next section with bipartite ESE-graphs.

The following main result follows from Lemma 18 and Lemma 20.

Theorem 13. ESE*-graphs with a cut vertex are bipartite.*

In the sequel, we first show some results related to cut vertices.

Lemma 14. *Let G be a connected* ESE*-graph with a cut vertex v, then each connected component of $G - v$ is also* ESE*.*

Proof: Let v be a cut vertex and $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_k$ $(k \geq 2)$ be the connected components of $G-v$. Assume H_i is not equimatchable (respectively ESE) for some $i \in [k]$. Then, there are two maximal matchings M_1 and M_2 in H_i (respectively in $H_i \setminus w_1w_2$ for some $w_1w_2 \in E(H_i)$) of different sizes. Let M be a maximal matching of $G \setminus H_i$ containing uv where $u \in H_j$ for some $j \neq i$. Then $M_1' = M_1 \cup M$ and $M_2' = M_2 \cup M$ are maximal matchings of G (respectively $G \setminus \{w_1w_2\}$) with different sizes, contradiction with equimatchability of G (respectively $G \setminus \{w_1w_2\}$). □

The following is a consequence of the proof of Lemma 14:

Corollary 15. *Let G be a connected equimatchable graph with a cut vertex v, then each connected component of $G - v$ is also equimatchable.*

Let us distinguish two types of graphs: a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is called *strong* if every maximal matching of G saturates v (or equivalently there is no maximal matching saturating all neighbors of v), otherwise it is called *weak*.

Lemma 16. *Let G be an* ESE*-graph with a cut vertex v. Then the followings hold;*

(i) *if v is a weak vertex in G, then $N(v)$ is a set of strong vertices in $G - v$,*

(ii) *if v is a strong vertex in G, then $N(v)$ is a set of weak vertices in $G - v$ and also $G \setminus \{v, w\}$ is an* ESE*-graph for each $w \in N(v)$*

Proof: Suppose that G is an ESE-graph and v is a cut vertex in G with components $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_k$ and $\nu(H_i) = m_i$. By Lemma 14, each component of $G - v$ is ESE.

(i) Let v be a weak vertex in G. Then, there exists a maximal matching M leaving v exposed, so M is the union of maximal matchings in each H_i, thus $|M| = \nu(G) = m_1 + m_2 + \ldots + m_k$. We claim that $N(v)$ contains only vertices which are strong in $G-v$. Otherwise, let $u \in N(v)$ be a weak vertex in $G-v$, then $vu \in E(G)$ can be extended to a maximal matching M' where $|M'| = 1 + m_1 + m_2 + \ldots + m_k$ since each H_i is equimatchable graph. This gives a contradiction with G being equimatchable.

(ii) Assume that v is a strong vertex, then $\nu(G) = \nu(G-v)+1 = m_1+m_2+\ldots+m_k+1$. Let $u \in N(v) \cap V(H_i)$ for $i \in [k]$ be a strong vertex in $G-v$, then $\nu(H_i) = \nu(H_i-u)+1$ and consequently $\nu(G \setminus \{v,u\}) = \nu(G-v)-1 = m_1+m_2+\ldots+m_k-1$. Extending such a matching with uv yields a maximal matching of G of size $m_1+m_2+\ldots+m_k$, a contradiction. Hence $N(v)$ is a set of weak vertices. On the other hand, for every vertex $w \in N(v) \cap V(H_i)$ for $i \in [k]$, we have that $H_i - w$ is equimatchable, since otherwise vw can be extended to two maximal matchings of G with different sizes. In addition, $H_i - w$ is also edge-stable. Assume for a contradiction that there is an edge $e \in E(H_i - w)$ such that $(H_i - w) \setminus e$ is not equimatchable. Then, in a similar way, vu can be extended to two maximal matchings of $G \setminus e$ of different sizes, contradiction with the edge stability of G. □

Lemma 14 and 16 together with the following structural result on maximum matchings will guide us through our objective.

Theorem 17 (Gallai-Edmonds decomposition)**.** *Lovasz and Plummer (1986) Let G be a graph, $D(G)$ the set of vertices of G that are not saturated by at least one maximum matching, $A(G)$ the set of vertices of $V(G) \setminus D(G)$ with at least one neighbor in $D(G)$, and $C(G) \stackrel{def}{=} V(G) \setminus (D(G) \cup A(G))$. Then:*

- (i) *the connected components of $G[D(G)]$ are factor-critical,*
- (ii) *$G[C(G)]$ has a perfect matching,*
- (iii) *every maximum matching of G matches every vertex of $A(G)$ to a vertex of a distinct component of $G[D(G)]$.*

The following lemma applies for ESE-graphs since they do not admit a perfect matching by Corollary 2 $i)$.

Lemma 18. *Lesk et al. (1984) Let G be a connected equimatchable graph with no perfect matching. Then $C(G) = \emptyset$ and $A(G)$ is an independent set of G.*

Lemma 19. *Let G be an* ESE*-graph and $v \in V(G)$ be a cut vertex. Then every factor-critical component of $G - v$ is trivial.*

Proof: Let D be a factor-critical component of $G - v$ with at least 3 vertices. We first note that since D is factor-critical, all vertices $w \in V(D)$ are weak in D. It follows from Lemma 16 that v is strong in G and for $w \in N_D(v)$, $D - w$ is ESE. However, $D - w$ has a perfect matching since D is factor-critical, contradiction to Corollary 2 $i)$. □

Lemma 20. *Let G be an* ESE*-graph with a cut vertex. Then every component of $D(G)$ in Gallai-Edmonds decomposition is trivial.*

Proof: Consider an ESE-graph G with a cut vertex. By Corollary 12, G is not factor-critical, moreover, it does not have a perfect matching by Corollary 2 $i)$. Consequently, G has a Gallai-Edmonds decomposition as described in Lemma 18 where $A(G) \neq \emptyset$. Let D be a nontrivial component of $D(G)$. By Theorem 17 $iii)$ and the equimatchability of G, every maximal matching of G matches every vertex of $A(G)$ to a vertex of a distinct component of $G[D(G)]$. This implies that for $w_1, w_2 \in V(D)$ and $a_1, a_2 \in A(G)$, if $w_1a_1 \in E(G)$ and $w_2a_2 \in E(G)$, then we have $w_1 = w_2$ or $a_1 = a_2$. In other words, for some edge

wa where $w \in V(D)$ and $a \in A(G)$, w or a is a cut vertex. If w is a cut vertex, $G - w$ must be ESE by Lemma 14; however, $D - w$ is a connected component of $G - w$ which has a perfect matching since D is factor-critical, contradiction by Corollary 2 i). Otherwise a is a cut vertex and $G - a$ has D as a factor-critical component which is not trivial, contradiction by Lemma 19. □

5 Bipartite ESE-graphs

Having characterized all 2-connected factor-critical ESE-graphs in Section 3 and having shown that ESE-graphs with a cut vertex are bipartite (Theorem 13), we now consider bipartite ESE-graphs to complete our characterization. We will see that bipartite ESE-graphs can be characterized in a way very similar to bipartite equimatchable graphs:

Lemma 21. *Lesk et al. (1984) A connected bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$, $|U| \leq |W|$ is equimatchable if and only if for every $u \in U$, there exists $S \subseteq N(u)$ such that $S \neq \emptyset$ and $|N(S)| \leq |S|$.*

Lemma 21, together with the well-known Hall's condition implies in particular that a connected bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$ with $|U| \leq |W|$ is equimatchable if and only if every maximal matching of G saturates U. In other words, G is equimatcahble if and only if every vertex in U is strong.

Remark 22. Let $G = (U \cup W, E)$, $|U| \leq |W|$ be a connected, bipartite, ESE-graph then $|U| < |W|$.

Proof: By Lemma 21, every maximal matching of G saturates U. It follows that if $|U| = |V|$ then G has a perfect matching, contradiction with Corollary 2 i). □

A strong vertex v is called *square-strong* if for every $u \in N(v)$, v is strong in $G - u$. For a vertex u, being square-strong is equivalent to say that every maximal matching in $G - u$ leaves at least two vertices of $N(u)$ exposed.

The following characterizes bipartite ESE-graphs.

Proposition 23. *Let $G = (U \cup W, E)$ be a connected bipartite graph with $|U| < |W|$. Then the followings are equivalent.*

(i) *G is* ESE.

(ii) *Every vertex of U is square-strong.*

(iii) *For every $u \in U$, there exists nonempty $S \subseteq N(u)$ such that $|N(S)| \leq |S| - 1$.*

Proof:

$(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$: Given a connected ESE graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$, $|U| < |W|$ and $u \in U$. We suppose the converse for a contradiction with the claim. Then, there exists $u \in U$ such that u is not square-strong, however, u is strong by Lemma 21 since G is equimatchable. It then follows that there is a vertex $v \in N(u)$ such that u is not strong in $G - v$. Therefore u is not strong in $G \setminus vu$, a contradiction to the fact that every vertex of U is strong in $G \setminus uv$ since G is ESE.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: Assume every vertex of U is square-strong. It means that for each $u \in U$, no matching in G saturates $N(u)$. Therefore, Hall's condition does not hold for $N(u)$, and consequently there exists nonempty $S \subseteq N(u)$ such that $|N(S)| < |S|$.

$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Suppose that for each $u \in U$, there exists a nonempty set $S \subseteq N(u)$ such that $|N(S)| \leq |S| - 1$. Remark that G is equimatchable by Lemma 21. It remains to show that $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable for $e = w_1w_2 \in E(G)$. If the endpoints of e belong to $S \cup \{u\}$, say $w_1 \in S$ and $w_2 = u$, let $S' = S \setminus w_1$, then we have $|N_{G\setminus e}(S')| \leq |N_G(S')| \leq |N_G(S)| \leq |S| - 1 = |S'|$ and $S' \subseteq N_{G\setminus e}(u)$, which implies by Lemma 21 that $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable. For the other cases, we conclude similarly since $|N_{G\setminus e}(S)| \leq |N_G(S)| \leq |S|$. As a result, $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable. □

The following is a consequence of Proposition 23 and Hall's condition:

Corollary 24. *A connected bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$ with $|U| < |W|$ is not* ESE *if and only if there exists $u \in U$ such that $N(u)$ is saturated by some (maximal) matching of G.*

Another equivalent interpretation of Proposition 23 would be as follows: A connected bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$ with $|U| < |W|$ is ESE if and only if for every $u \in U$, every maximal matching of $G - u$ leaves at least two vertices of $N(u)$ exposed.

To conclude this section, let us exhibit a subclass of bipartite ESE-graphs in Remark 25 (which can be easily checked using Corollary 24).

Remark 25. All connected spanning subgraphs of $K_{r,s}$ with $r < s$ such that for every $u \in U$, $d(u) \geq |r| + 1$ where $|U| = r$ are ESE-graph.

Indeed, the graphs in Remark 25 can be recognized in linear time just by checking the degree of each vertex in the small part of the bipartition, however, the class of bipartite ESE-graphs is not limited to this subclass as shown by an example in Figure 4.



Fig. 4: A bipartite ESE-graph with a vertex u of degree 3.

6 Recognition of ESE-graphs

The recognition of ESE-graphs is trivially polynomial since checking equimatchability can be done in time $O(n^2m)$ for a graph with n vertices and m edges (see Demange and Ekim (2014)) and it is enough to repeat this check for every edge removal. This trivial procedure gives a recognition algorithm for ESE-graphs in time $O(n^2m^2)$. However, using the characterization of ESE-graphs, we can improve this time complexity in a significant way.

Theorem 26. ESE*-graphs can be recognized in time* $O(\min(n^{3.376}, n^{1.5}m))$.

Proof: Let us first note that Theorems 3 and 13 imply that an ESE-graph is either (2-connected) factor-critical or bipartite.

Remark 11 exhibits all factor-critical ESE-graphs with at most 5 vertices; it is clear that one can check in linear time if the given graph is isomorphic to one of them. Besides, one can also check whether a given graph with at least 7 vertices is factor-critical ESE in linear time ($O(n+m)$) using the characterization given in Theorem 9. Indeed, to decide whether G is isomorphic to $K_{2r+1} \setminus M$ for some matching M, it is enough to check if the minimum degree is at least $2r-1$. To decide whether G admits an independent set S of size at least 3 which is complete to $G \setminus S$ and $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$, one can simply search for a connected component of the complement of G which is a clique (in linear time); if yes it is the unique candidate for the set S. Then to check whether $\nu(G \setminus S) = 1$, it is enough to notice that a graph has matching number 1 if and only if it is the disjoint union of a triangle and isolated vertices, or a star and isolated vertices. To recognize these graphs, one can check whether the degree sequence of $G \setminus S$ is one of $k, 1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0$ (where $k \geq 1$ and there are k times 1) or $2, 2, 2, 0, \ldots, 0$ where there is possibly no vertex of degree 0 at all. Clearly, these can be done in linear time.
Now, in order to decide whether a bipartite graph G is ESE, we use Corollary 24. For every vertex $u \in U$ where U is the small part of the bipartition, compute a maximum matching of the bipartite graph $G[N(u) \cup N(N(u))]$; if $\nu(G[N(u) \cup N(N(u))]) = |N(u)|$ for some $u \in U$, then it means that G is not ESE; otherwise it is ESE. This check requires at most n computation of a maximum matching in a bipartite graph, which can be done in time $O(n^{2,376})$ Mucha and Sankowski (2004) or in time $O(\sqrt{n}m)$ which runs in time $O(n^{2.5})$ in case of dense graphs but becomes near-linear for random graphs Hopcroft and Karp (1973). As this term dominates, it follows that the overall complexity of this recognition algorithm is $O(\min(n^{3.376}, n^{1.5}m))$. □

7 Vertex-Stable Equimatchable Graphs

Similar to edge-stability, one can consider vertex-stability of equimatchable graphs and ask when an equimatchable graph remains equimatchable upon removal of any vertex. We define a graph G as *vertex-stable equimatchable* (VSE) if G is equimatchable and $G - v$ is equimatchable for every $v \in V(G)$. In this section, we give a full description of VSE-graphs which turns out to be much simpler than the characterization of ESE-graphs.

If we require not only $G - v$ for some $v \in V(G)$ to remain equimatchable, but also all induced subgraphs of G, then this coincides with the notion of hereditary equimatchable graphs which is already studied in Dibek et al. (2015) where the following characterization is obtained:

Theorem 27. *Dibek et al. (2015) Every induced subgraph of a connected equimatchable graph G is equimatchable if and only if G is isomorphic to a complete graph or a complete bipartite graph.*

Since being hereditary equimatchable implies being VSE, we have the following.

Corollary 28. *Complete graphs and complete bipartite graphs are* VSE*-graphs.*

Lemma 29. *Factor-critical* VSE*-graphs are odd cliques.*

Proof: Assume there is a factor-critical VSE-graph G which is not an odd clique. Since G is factor-critical VSE, $G - u$ has a perfect matching and $G - u$ is equimatchable. It follows that for every $u \in V(G)$, $G - u$ is randomly matchable, which is either K_{2r} or $K_{r,r}$ for some $r \geq 1$ by Sumner (1979). Because $G \ncong K_{2r+1}$ and G has at least 3 vertices, there is a vertex $u \in V(G)$ such that $G - u$ is not a complete graph, therefore $G - u \cong K_{r,r}$. Note that factor-critical graphs can not be bipartite, implying that u has

at least one neighbour in each part of the complete bipartite graph $G - u$. However, in this case, taking into account that G is not a K_3, there is a vertex $w \in V(G-u)$ such that $G - w$ is neither complete nor complete bipartite, contradiction. Hence $G \cong K_{2r+1}$. □

Lemma 30. *Let G be a* VSE*-graph which is not a complete graph. Then, G is bipartite.*

Proof: We suppose the contrary, then there is a VSE-graph G apart from both complete graph and bipartite graph. It then follows that G is not randomly matchable and so G has no perfect matching. Consequently, G has a Gallai-Edmonds decomposition as described in Lemma 18. Since G is different from a complete graph, by Lemma 29, it is not factor-critical and consequently we have $|A(G)| \geq 1$. Moreover, by Theorem 17 $iii)$ and the equimatchability of G, every maximal matching of G matches every vertex of $A(G)$ with a vertex of a distinct component of $G[D(G)]$. This implies that the number of components of $D(G)$ is greater than or equal to the number of vertices of $A(G)$. If $D(G)$ consists of only one component, then $|A(G)| = 1$ and G corresponds to an even clique because G has a perfect matching; indeed $G[D(G)]$ is factor critical, thus it has a matching of size $(|D(G)| - 1)/2$, moreover $D(G)$ has a neighbour in $A(G)$. We now assume that there are at least two components of $G[D(G)]$, and at least one component of $G[D(G)]$, say $D_1(G)$, is factor critical with at least 3 vertices since G is not bipartite. Select another component of $G[D(G)]$, say $D_2(G)$, and let $t_1, t_2 \in N(v)$ where $t_1 \in V(D_1(G))$ and $t_2 \in V(D_2(G))$. Let w be a vertex in $D_1(G) - t_1$. Then $G - w$ has two matchings M_1, M_2 with different sizes obtained respectively by extending vt_i to a maximal matching for $i = 1, 2$. It is a contradiction, with the equimatchability of $G - w$, hence G is bipartite. □

Lemma 31. *Let G be a bipartite graph apart from complete bipartite. Then G is* VSE *if and only if G is* ESE*.*

Proof: Assume that G is VSE. Then $G - v$ is equimatchable for every $v \in V(G)$. It implies that for every vertex $w \in N(v)$, v is strong in $G \setminus vw$ for $v \in V(G)$. Hence G is ESE.

We now assume that $G = (U \cup W, E)$ is a bipartite ESE-graph with $|U| < |W|$. Then $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable for every $e \in E(G)$. Since $G \setminus e$ is equimatchable, every vertex of U is strong in $G \setminus e$ by Lemma 21. It then follows that for every $u \in U$, every maximal matching of G leaves at least two vertices of $N(u)$ exposed. Hence the removal of any vertex from G does not change equimatchability. Therefore, G is also VSE.

□

As a consequence of Theorem 3 and Corollary 28 and Lemmas 29, 30 and 31, we have the following characterization of VSE-graphs.

Theorem 32. *A graph G is* VSE *if and only if G is either a complete graph or a complete bipartite graph or a bipartite* ESE*-graph.*

Since complete graphs can be recognized in linear time, the time complexity of recognizing VSE-graphs is equivalent to the time complexity of recognizing bipartite ESE-graphs, thus we have the following by the proof of Theorem 26.

Corollary 33. VSE*-graphs can be recognized in time $O(\min(n^{3.376}, n^{1.5}m))$.*

8 Concluding Remarks

Let us first summarize our findings in Figure 5. As depicted in Figure 5, a natural consequence of the characterizations of ESE-graphs and VSE-graphs is the following:

Corollary 34. *Let G be an equimatchable graph. $G - v$ and $G \setminus e$ are equimatchable for all $v \in V(G)$ and all $e \in E(G)$ if and only if G is either an odd clique or a bipartite* ESE*-graph.*



Fig. 5: Illustration of the classes of ESE-graphs and VSE-graphs.

Let us conclude with a discussion on some notions related to ESE and VSE-graphs. In contrast to ESE-graphs, one can introduce the notion of equimatchable graphs such that the removal of any edge harms the equimatchability. More formally, let G be an equimatchable graph, we say that $e \in E(G)$ is a *critical-edge* if $G \setminus e$ is not equimatchable. Note that if an equimatchable graph G is not edge-stable, then it has a critical-edge. A graph G is called *edge-critical equimatchable*, denoted *ECE* for short, if G is equimatchable and every $e \in E(G)$ is critical. Similarly, one can introduce *vertex-critical* equimatchable graphs as equimatchable graphs which loose their equimatchability by the removal of any vertex.

We note that ECE-graphs can be obtained from any equimatchable graph by recursively removing non-critical edges. We also remark that if e is non-critical then $\nu(G) = \nu(G - e)$ as already shown in Proposition 1. Some preliminary results show that ECE-graphs are either 2-connected factor-critical or 2-connected bipartite or K_{2t} for some $t \geq 1$. Moreover, connected bipartite ECE-graphs can be characterized using similar arguments as in the characterization of bipartite ESE-graphs. In order to complete the characterization of ECE-graphs, it remains to complete the case of factor-critical ECE-graphs. On the other hand, as for the VSE-graphs versus ESE-graphs, the description of VCE-graphs seems to be much simpler than the description of ECE-graphs.

References

M. Demange and T. Ekim. Efficient recognition of equimatchable graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 114:66–71, 2014.

C. Dibek, T. Ekim, D. Gozupek, and M. Shalom. Equimatchable graphs are C_{2k+1}-free for $k \geq 4$. *Submitted*, 2015.

E. Eiben and M. Kotrbcik. Equimatchable graphs on surfaces. *J. Graph Theory*, 81:35–49, 2016.

O. Favaron. Equimatchable factor-critical graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 10:439–448, 1986.

J. E. Hopcroft and R. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 2 (4):225–231, 1973.

K.-I. Kawarabayashi and M. Plummer. Bounding the size of equimatchable graphs of fixed genus. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 1:91–99, 2009.

M. Lesk, M. D. Plummer, and W. R. Pulleyblank. Equi-matchable graphs. *Proc. Cambridge Combinatorial Conference in Honour of Paul Erdos, B. Bollobas, (editor), Academic Press, London*, pages 239–254, 1984.

L. Lovasz and M. Plummer. Matching theory. *North-Holland, Amsterdam, Annals of Discrete Mathematics edition*, 29, 1986.

M. Mucha and P. Sankowski. Maximum matchings via gaussian elimination. pages 248–255, 2004.

D. P. Sumner. Randomly matchable graphs. *J . Graph Theory*, 3:183–186, 1979.